



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

traditions of poetry, and specifically by the sentiment of the poem. *The Wanderer* is reminiscent; the raven, the eagle, and the wolf, no longer forebode carnage (as in *Judith* 205 f. and *Maldon* 106 f.), nor do they greedily despoil the slain (as in *Brunanburh* 60 f.), but their finished work is now mingled in the mournful and vivid recollection of the sad fate of the warriors. The poets have thus handled this favorite theme of portent and of horror from three points of view,—the future, the present, and the past.

The poet of *The Wanderer* has added the circumstance of occasional burial, and, inasmuch as *sumne* thrice repeated distributes *sume*, this should mean the burial of a warrior who has fallen in battle, and complete the enumeration of what may befall the body of the slain hero. As to *ofer hæanne holm*, there is no difficulty; the carnivorous birds,—the eagle, the raven, and the sea-birds,—build their aeries in the high cliffs, they feed upon the corpse of Paetus (Propertius, iv (iii) viii, 8-12), and delay their journey over the sea that they may join the Thracian dogs and wolves at the feast of carrion on the plain of Pharsalia (Lucan, vii, 832 f.).

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

THE SOURCES OF DAVENANT'S *The Siege of Rhodes.*

In the history of the English stage there has been no piece of a more epoch-making character than Davenant's *Siege of Rhodes*.¹ The first part of this play appeared in 1656, and was the second piece of a dramatic nature produced during the Commonwealth. With its first presentation were introduced at least three innovations of far-reaching importance: movable scenery, women actors in female parts (these had been taken by boys before this), and an attempt at the opera,² all of which may be attributed to French influence. Besides, some have been inclined to dispute the claim for Boyle's *Mustapha* as the first heroic play, in favor of this piece; but since Davenant did not employ the heroic couplet throughout, this distinction cannot be justly claimed for him, although, in his effort "to introduce the examples of moral virtue, writ in verse," he

¹ Folio edition of Davenant's works, p. 1 ff. London (Herringham), 1673; *Dramatists of the Restoration*. Ed. Maidment and Logan, iii, 247. Edinburgh, 1872-4.

² Davenant calls it *Stylo-Recitativo*, that is, "alternately sung and recited."

has certainly approximated the heroic play, and Dryden in his *Essay on Heroick Plays* has accorded him the credit (if it may be called *credit*) of setting the fashion for them.

The merit of the first part of the *Siege of Rhodes* is only mediocre, at best. It wants, to quote Dryden again, "the fulness of a plot, and the variety of characters to form it as it ought." The second part, naturally a continuation of the first, was first acted after the Restoration in 1661, and is wanting in several of the faults which characterized part one. An edition of the two parts, with the first somewhat enlarged—chiefly by the addition of the character Roxolana—appeared in 1663, and is dedicated to the Earl of Clarendon.

With regard to the source of the *Siege of Rhodes* no suggestion has heretofore been made, except that the play exhibits some agreement with history, which is confessed in fact by the poet in his prefatory notice. Indeed, Davenant has been grievously neglected by English students in the matter of sources. And this is no more painfully illustrated than in the case of the late editors of his dramatic works—Maidment and Logan—from whom so much might have been expected.³ For Davenant's sources are not so skillfully concealed as one might imagine from the meagre knowledge which we possess concerning them. In the case of the *Siege of Rhodes*, it is a matter of surprise that Schick or Sarrazin have not discovered its connections.

For the purpose of bringing the plot of the play before us, a brief outline is submitted. Ianthe, the lately-wedded wife of Alphonso, who is fighting in defense of Rhodes, while on her way from Sicily to join her husband, is taken prisoner by Mustapha, one of the Turkish bassas. She is conducted before Solyman, Sultan of the Turks, veiled according to the promise of her captor, and is sent thence by Solyman, though reluctantly, since he has become enamored of her, to Alphonso at Rhodes. The Turks lay siege to Rhodes, but are at first repulsed owing to the bravery of the Sicilian ally. The tide of war finally turns, and the Rhodians are reduced to great distress. Their only hope is in Ianthe, who goes in

³ It is with much disappointment that one turns to the late edition of the plays to find scarcely a page bearing on the originals of Davenant's plot as against a dozen or more devoted to details concerning the opera, heroic play, etc., such as are easily accessible in almost any handbook of the stage.

person, without any passport or protection whatever, to the court of Solyman to sue for mercy. The Sultan now again consumed with a burning love, less virtuous than at first, detains her, consigning her to the keeping of his queen Roxolana. The Rhodians, maddened at this treacherous act, make a desperate sally against the Turkish forces, in which Alphonso falls captive. Roxolana asks that the prisoner be placed at her disposal, which being granted, she restores him to Ianthe. The manliness of Solyman again asserts itself, and both Ianthe and Alphonso are set free, while to the former the privilege of making her terms for the beleaguered city is given.

The setting we at once recognize as historical. The siege of Rhodes was begun by Solyman in the spring of 1522, and culminated in the downfall of that city on Dec. 25th of the same year. The Sultan Solyman is the famed Solyman II., the Magnificent, who was at the head of the Turkish government from 1520 to 1566;—Roxolana is his infamous queen who brought about the overthrow of his renowned son and general, Mustapha. Other historical names which reappear in Davenant are Pirrhus, Haly and Rustan among the Turks, and, among the Rhodians, Phillippus Villerius Lili-dama, Grand Master of the city, preserved by Davenant as *Villerius*. Alphonso also, the hero of our play, according to Knolles (i, 385, London, 1687 to 1700), was a captain of a galley captured by the Turks. A historical prototype of Ianthe alone of all Davenant's leading characters is sought for in vain. Neither any person by her name nor anyone approximating her is to be found in the history of this period. Besides this, to only a few of the historical personages whom Davenant uses are their historical roles allotted. We are confronted, then, with a deviation from history. Whence, we ask, are these unhistorical features; whence the wholly unhistorical Ianthe? Are they coinages of the ingenious Caroline laureate; or has he introduced into his historical setting some extraneous bits of romance? Are these original with Davenant, or not? A glance at the poet's works contemporary with the *Siege of Rhodes* establishes a suspicion at least that they are not original. Davenant, like certain of his Restoration fellow-poets, was carried away by the wave which for a time swept from the stage and from popularity the legitimate drama, and substituted in its place the so-called

modernization or adaptation; indeed he contributed as much as any of his contemporaries to the establishment of this fashion. His *Rivals* is, as is well known, an unfortunate alteration of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*; his *Law Against Lovers* is an equally unsuccessful modernization of Shakspeare, consisting of a combination of *Measure for Measure* and *Much Ado About Nothing*; his *Man's the Master* is a parallel combination of two plays of Scarron;⁴ while to his *Macbeth* and *Tempest* (the latter of which Dryden had a hand in) as mutilations of the master it is unnecessary to revert. In short, there is but one entire play composed by Davenant subsequent to the execution of Charles I. which is not palpably an alteration or modernization of some greater work. This circumstance arouses a very strong suspicion that it too is at least unoriginal.

In our search for this original—for it is evident from the start that the play is not a modernization—it is but fair that we first hear Davenant himself. In his preface to the play he says:

"In this poem I have revived the remembrance of that desolation which was permitted by Christian princes, when they favored the ambition of such as defended the diversity of religions (begot by the factions of learning) in Germany; whilst those who would never admit learning into their empire . . . did make Rhodes defenceless, which was the only fortify'd academy in christendom where divinity and arms were equally profess'd. *I have likewise, for variety, softened the martial encounters between Solyman and the Rhodians, with intermingling the conjugal virtues of Alphonso and Ianthe.* . . ."⁵

No hint have we here save the tacit confession that the "intermingling the conjugal virtues of Alphonso and Ianthe" is an addition to the historical skeleton,—we are the rather led to suppose that this is only the poet's invention.

Reference to any handbook of bibliography discloses the fact that sixteenth century Turkish history has afforded the source of more than one drama or romance. France alone, during the next decade preceding the first presentation of the *Siege of Rhodes*, produced no less than three works based on incidents from the career of Solyman. These are Madeline Scudéry's voluminous romance *Ibrahim, ou l'Illustre Bassa* (1641), the drama of Georges de Scudéry bearing the same title and founded on it (1643),

⁴ *Jodlet ou le Maistre Valet* and *L'Heretier Ridicule*.
⁵ *Dram. Rest.*, iii, 258.

and Desfontaines' drama *La Perside*, a sort of sequel to the romance, which appeared in 1644.⁶ All these deal with the life of Solyman, and especially with his love for Isabella, the wife of his favorite bassa, Ibrahim. In this love of the Sultan for a most beautiful woman who rejects his offers in favor of an earlier and humbler lover, in the latter's brave defense of and untiring fidelity to her, and, most striking of all, in the fickleness of Solyman in his alternate resolutions to regard or to disregard his obligations as a man of honor to a subject, to which must be added the jealousy of the sultana Roxolana, we seem to have, and indeed do have, just such motives as are employed by Davenant. This partial identity of plot is, however, as will develop later, only accidental, and is altogether unsatisfactory as a solution of our problem. The Scudéry's have nothing whatever to do with the *siege* of Rhodes, and their hero Ibrahim (=Mustapha) did not figure prominently in history until several years after the fall of Rhodes. Add to this the fact that their lovers are neither Sicilians nor Rhodians, and the Scudéry drama and romance must be dismissed from the probabilities.

Examining next the drama of Desfontaines, *La Perside*, it will first be noted that it appeared in the year 1644, or just at the commencement of Davenant's residence at the French capital, which at once arouses a predisposition in favor of it as a possibility; for, since he had played the leading part in English dramatic history for some time already, and had recently been made the nation's laureate, he must have been most cordially welcomed into theatrical circles on his arrival at Paris, where he, in all probability, met both Desfontaines and the Scudéry's. The subject of the drama, *La Perside*, indicates a departure from the Scudéry type, the Solyman-Isabella story; and it is, in fact, somewhat different from it, being a combination of the same with the even more popular Solyman-Perseda story, in which the latter has been followed at first, but soon merged into the former. The heroine of the story is here Persede,—the hero corresponding

to Ibrahim of the romance, Eraste. The character and rôle of Solyman differ but little. There is one step nearer the Davenant plot in the circumstance that the lovers are Rhodians. This is the only gain, however, since, as noted, the drama is based almost entirely on Scudéry, and only takes its introduction up to the capture of its heroine, from the Solyman-Perseda branch. But while it offers little, if any, more probability as a source than the works already considered, it puts us on the track of the real solution of the problem, and we dismiss *La Perside* with the feeling that it may at least have given Davenant his first suggestion.

Following the thread afforded by Desfontaines, let us examine the Solyman-Perseda literature. This consists of a group of four works, two French and two English, Yver's *Le Printemps* and Mainfray's *La Rhodienne*, Wotton's *Cupid's Cautels* and Kyd's *Solyman and Perseda*. The first employment of the theme seems to have been *Le Printemps d'Yver*, which appeared in 1572. From this, twenty years later, Wotton made the translation which Schick and Sarrazin have shown to be the source of Kyd's play. Mainfray's drama, *La Rhodienne*, 1637, is based on Yver. Each of these has preserved the story as with Yver with remarkable fidelity, the only deviations of any importance being a slight alteration in the Perseda death scene by Kyd, and the abridgment by Mainfray for dramatic purposes, doubtless of the early history of the lovers.⁷ For this reason the comparison with *Siege of Rhodes* may be made almost equally well with anyone of this group.

Erastus and Perseda, for such are the names of the lovers here, as with Desfontaines, correspond to Alphonso and Ianthe of Davenant. With the Yver-group, however, the whole story of their early life is related. They are natives of Rhodes, where early infatuated with each other, they grow up together. Perseda gives Erastus a chain in token of her love, and he in turn agrees never to part with it so long as life shall last; but shortly after, engaging in a tournament, in which he overcomes all his antagonists, the chain is lost and he is ren-

6 A dissertation devoted to Solyman literature in general has aided me materially in this study. It is entitled *Die Geschichte von Soliman und Perseda in der neueren Litteratur*, by Ernst Sieper, Weimar, 1895. The work also appears in the *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Litgesch.* ix, 33 f. To be compared also in this connection are *Thomas Kyd und sein Kreis*, by Gregor Sarrazin, Berlin, 1892, and the review of the same by Schick in Herrig's *Archiv* xc, 176 f.

7 I regret very much that I have been unable to consult Mainfray's work. There is no copy of it in the British Museum, but it may be found in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal (Sieper 6). I have handled all the versions of the cycle. Valuable abstracts of each are submitted by Sieper in his monograph *ut supra*. Wotton's novel, which is not very accessible in America, is reprinted by Sarrazin in his *Thomas Kyd und sein Kreis*, pp. 12-40.

dered most unhappy. It is found by one of the jousts, Fernando by name, who gives it to his lady-love Lucina. Perseda discovers the chain on the neck of Lucina, and immediately concludes that Erastus is false to her; nor can he convince her of the contrary. Erastus ultimately, by artifice, secures the chain again, but while on his way to Perseda with it, he is attacked by Fernando, whom he slays in self-defense. This act necessitates his leaving Rhodes, and it is to Solyman his arch-enemy that he goes. At the Turkish court, owing to his bravery and ingenuousness, he soon acquires much favor and distinction.—The Sultan's forces lay siege to Rhodes and carry away Perseda captive. She is presented to Solyman, who becomes desperately enamoured of her. All his proposals, however, she courteously but firmly rejects, assuring him that she will die sooner than prove faithless to Erastus. And here the magnanimity of Solyman asserts itself;—he sends for Erastus, presents him to Perseda, and ratifies their marriage. Erastus is now appointed Governor of Rhodes, but the happy pair have scarcely left the Turkish Court, when Solyman's baser nature regains supremacy over him, and he makes the fatal determination to have Perseda for his queen come what may. By the advice of Brusor, one of his bassas, who is jealous of Erastus, the newly-appointed Rhodian Governor is recalled, charges of high treason preferred against him, and with only the semblance of a trial, he is condemned to a disgraceful death. Solyman then proceeds towards Rhodes; but Perseda having heard in advance of the foul death of her lover, has hastily collected the Rhodians, and appears with them, at Solyman's approach, on the walls of the city, where being mistaken for a common soldier, she falls mortally wounded by a Turkish bullet. Comparing this story with the plot of the *Siege of Rhodes*, we find first of all that, with the exception of Solyman (whose name runs through the entire cycle), and the comparatively unimportant Villierius, there is a complete dissimilarity of names; while the following more or less important differences in narrative may be noted:

1. With the Yver-group the lovers grow up together in the city of Rhodes, whence Erastus flees on slaying Fernando; with Davenant they are Sicilians of whose early history no mention is made.

2. There is a reversal of the situation with regard to the hero: on the one hand, he is a general in the Turkish army; on the other, he is an ally of the Rhodian forces engaged against the Turks.

3. The same is true of the heroine. Perseda appears only once at Solyman's court—and that after having been taken prisoner in an attack on Rhodes, while Ianthe is twice in the Sultan's hands—once by capture while on her way from Sicily to Rhodes, again when she voluntarily yields herself hoping to obtain a cessation of hostilities.

4. There are *two* exhibitions of Solyman's magnanimity with Davenant as against *one* with the Yver-group, a difference growing out of the one just cited.

5. Lastly—the most striking variation of all—with the Yver-group the conclusion is tragic. Erastus suffers a violent death, while Perseda dies in defense of her native city. With Davenant, on the other hand, the story ends happily, the two lovers being permitted to return to Rhodes and the fate of the city left in their hands.

Examining next the points of agreement:

1. There is exact correspondence between the leading characters of the two stories. Solyman appears in both with the same name, and very similar rôles. Perseda corresponds to Ianthe, and Erastus with Alphonso. Villierius likewise agrees in general with the Villiers or Philipppo of the Yver-group. To the subordinate characters, Lucina and Fernando, Davenant naturally offers no parallels, since he entirely passes over the early history of his two lovers. As for Roxolana and the remaining characters in Davenant and not in the Solyman-Perseda story, these as will be subsequently shown, were taken from history.

2. Both deal with the same historical happenings, the Siege of Rhodes, which, however, they only use as a skeleton or framework in which they insert an unhistoric love episode from which the real action develops.

3. The main motives of the action are the same: *a.* Hero and heroine are separated by the fortunes of war; *b.* The heroine, falling into the hands of Solyman, is desperately loved by him; *c.* Her fidelity and general nobility of conduct arouses his magnanimity, and she is delivered over safely to her lover; *d.* Solyman subsequently changes his resolution, and endeavors to regain the person of

the heroine; *e.* Both his efforts in this connection are futile—though in different ways.

4. It is not an altogether unimportant agreement that the heroine in each appears, on the approach of Solymán after his first change of resolution, on the walls of the city of Rhodes⁸ and at the head of its defenders, whom she urges on in their combat with the Turks. In each case she is disguised,—in each she suffers defeat.

These coincidences cannot be accidental, but are significant as showing that Davenant got the main source of his plot (as far as the action is concerned)—the Alphonso-Ianthe episode—from some one of the Yver-group. As for the skeleton of his plot, it has already been seen that it is historical. The same holds for the characters which Davenant has added to those of his main source. Of these Roxolana alone plays an important part. She appears in history as the jealous queen, but rather of Mustapha, Solymán's favorite, who is a rival of her eldest son for the throne of Turkey. Davenant in making her jealous also of her rivals for Solymán's love has possibly leaned on Madeline Scudéry, although the latter professes to be based on history (Paolo Giovio), and it is more than probable that Davenant, too, found some hint of this in history. As to the remaining characters, Mustapha, Pirrhus, Haly, Rustan, Orchan and Zangiban, little need be said. They have been chosen at random, as is characteristic of Davenant in his *Albovine*, from history contemporary with that which forms the background of the story, and have been used largely as padding. None of them, save possibly Mustapha who is in charge of the naval forces which capture Ianthe and her galley, plays any significant part in the action. The theory of a Scudéry influence on Davenant may, to be sure, be advanced in consideration of the fact that many of these names appear in the *Ibrahim* romance; but it develops from an examination of that work that not all these additional names appear there; moreover, we have Davenant's own statement in his preface to the effect that he has made a partial use of

⁸ In the Yver-group in the Perseda death-scene; in Davenant at the first defense of the city, cf. *Dram. Rest.* iii, 290, where Ianthe appears in the English station, and is seen by Solymán and Mustapha. Cf. also *Dram. Rest.* iii, 292:

Admiral. "Haste, haste! Ianthe in disguise
At the English bulwarks wounded lies."

history, and we have no reason to discredit him. The most, then, we can claim for the Scudéry-group is a possible suggestion of the subject as affording a good dramatic plot, with the chances in any case largely in favor of Desfontaines, rather than either Scudéry.

Turning again to the main source of Davenant's drama and instituting a search for the grounds of Davenant's variations from the basal stories, we discover two important conditions which led to these: 1. a desire to preserve the unities after the French fashion, a so-called dramatic law which Davenant had not too faithfully observed in his early dramas; and 2. a desire for a comic or tragi-comic *dénoûement*. To the first may be attributed the omission of the early romantic history of hero and heroine; to the latter, the radical variation in taking Ianthe back to the Turkish Court a second time, thus affording a second exhibition of the magnanimity of Solymán's character and enhancing the figure of Ianthe.⁹ The slight change of names may be accounted for in the pardonable inclination of the dramatist to conceal his sources.

A somewhat unsatisfactory result is obtained in that no one production is settled on as a source. This, however, is not altogether of great importance, and is, so far as can now be seen, unavoidable, since the several versions of the Yver-group agree most closely in incident, and there is almost no variation in names. The case for the English versions, Kyd and Wotton, and especially Kyd, would at first seem the stronger, but when it is borne in mind that Davenant had spent several years in Paris just prior to the composition of his play, the probability would seem to favor Yver or Mainfray. An agreement of the latter with Davenant in that he too passes over the youth of the lovers, is neither important nor in any way determining, since the change in both cases would naturally result from an effort to preserve the unities. Any attempt to show any particular one of these to be Davenant's source on the basis of internal evidence would, I believe, prove futile.

Our conclusion, then, may be summed up as follows: Davenant in his *Siege of Rhodes*, while employing a historical background, has

⁹ We have here a neat parallel to Davenant's later alteration of the *Two Noble Kinsmen*, his *Rivals*, in which he has also, by a simple change of the catastrophe, converted a tragedy into a comedy. Cf. Krasenbaum's Diss., *The Rivals and T. T. N. K.* Halle-Wittenberg, 1895.

made use of the Solymán-Perseda episode for the body of his story. His deviations from this source have flowed from natural conditions, chiefly the desire to observe the requirements of the classic drama and to make out of his tragic original a comedy rather than a tragedy. Any apparent agreement with the Scudéry-group is only accidental. The question as to which one of the Yver-group, whether Yver or Wotton or Kyd or Mainfray, was used by Davenant is left open and most probably will always remain so.

KILLIS CAMPBELL.

Johns Hopkins University.

GERMAN LANGUAGE.

German Orthography and Phonology. A Treatise with a Word-List. By GEORGE HEMPL, Ph. D., Professor of English Philology and General Linguistics in the University of Michigan. Part i. The Treatise. Boston, U.S.A., and London: Ginn & Co., 1897. 12mo, pp. xxxii, 264.

PROFESSOR HEMPL'S treatise on *German Orthography and Phonology* deserves the highest praise for its scholarly thoroughness and accuracy. Not satisfied with giving a simple compilation of what others had done before him, the author has embodied in his book the results of much original work, and it will consequently claim the attention of students of German not only in this country, but also in the Fatherland.

For the second time within less than two years, Germany has had to thank American scholarship for a generous contribution toward the understanding of German speech and thought. Beside the present work I have, of course, in mind Professor Francke's admirable *Social Forces in German Literature*, of which I am reminded also by another consideration. The two books mark—it seems to me—an epoch in the study of German in this country: in each case an interesting struggle has been fought between the publisher and the author, and the author has carried the day. Originally, it was the publisher's desire to issue an inexpensive elementary school book, but in the hands of the author the book grew to be an independent work of original value. It is a good sign that the publishers should in each case have been willing to print a book which was not intended to be of immediate use in

the class room. Let us hope that the buyers of such advanced works will prove numerous enough to encourage the publishers in their generous efforts.

Professor Hempl's book "aims to be a systematic and practical treatise on the subjects pertaining to the writing, printing and uttering of Modern German." (I should have preferred: "to the printing, spelling and uttering," etc.)

Of the four books which it is to contain the first three (Orthography, Phonology, Accent) have appeared, while the fourth one, a Word-List together with a complete Index, is to form the Second Part, which we hope will soon appear.

The chapters of the First Book, five in number, treat of the Alphabet, Spelling, Division of Words, Use of Capitals and Punctuation respectively; of these the chapter on the Alphabet in which Mr. Hempl sketches the development of the forms of German letters does not quite satisfy me. Why should we not be given the forms of *all* the letters of the early alphabets? Or—if space were lacking—why should anything be presented save the Roman, Schwabach and Fraktur alphabets? Furthermore, in the second chapter, we miss a systematic treatment of the varieties of spelling, interesting as are the twenty selections in § 30.

As to the German script, given on p. 12, the second forms of *M* and *N*, given in the list, I have seen only in letters of business men who, as is generally known, use a strange mixture of German and Roman script.

The Second Book, on Phonology, contains three chapters. In the first is given, in the narrow compass of less than thirty pages, an admirable abstract on Phonetics; then follows the chapter on German Speech-Sounds; the last chapter, treating of Pronunciation, is the most interesting of this Book. The author here takes up the questions of a Standard of Pronunciation, of Stage Pronunciation, of the Best German. To characterize his attitude, I quote from the Preface, pp. xiv sq.:

"I am not the advocate of the unique value of the German pronunciation of any one province. I have aimed to enable the learner to choose in each particular that usage that is most general—which not only will offend the fewest ears, but which also stands the best chance of ultimately prevailing. Such a 'Durchschnitts deutsch' is most likely to find actual realization in the capital of the nation, especially if that